

FILED
LOGED
RECEIVED

MAIL

OCT 11 2022

AT SEATTLE
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
BY DEPUTY

Private Post Office Address

:Jos: Daniel©

c/o 1776 Park Avenue #142

Summit County, Utah State

Latitude 40° 38' 45" N; Longitude 111° 29' 52" W – Above Sea Level

September 29, 2022

COMPLAINT LETTER

Steven C. Gonzalez

Chief Administrative law Judge State of Washington

c/o Washington Supreme Court

243 Israel Road SE, Town Center East Building, 3 First Floor

Tumwater, WA, 98501-6415

Mailing Address: PO Box 40929 Olympia, WA, 98504-0929

Robert H. Alsdorf, Chair of the Commission, Lawyer Member

Including All other Commission Members

State of Washington Commission on Judicial Conduct

P.O. Box 1817 Olympia, WA, 98507

FILED (DROP BOX)
OCT 11 2022
AT SEATTLE
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
BY DEPUTY

Dear Sir/Madam:

The enclosed Notice of Nul Tiel Corporation and Notice of Intent to Join a Class Action Lawsuit, is being forwarded to your attention pursuant to the Utah Constitution Article VIII, Sec. 13 and Utah Code Ann. Sec. 78A-11-101-113 (and pursuant to Idaho Code §1-2101, §1-2102, §1-2103, and pursuant to Article V Section 28 of the Constitution of the State of Idaho and pursuant to article VI of the California Constitution in 1926 under the law of comity) and to bring to your personal attention the criminal activities of various Washington trial court officials.

According to the public record, the **State of Washington Commission on Judicial Conduct** is the rule-making arm of the Washington trial court system. The Washington Rules of Court are rules adopted by the State of Washington Commission on Judicial Conduct. Every court may also make local rules for its own government and the government of its officers not inconsistent with law or with the rules adopted and prescribed by the Commission on Judicial Conduct. The policymaking body of the Washington courts is the Commission on Judicial Conduct and its Members and staff.

It is imperative that your trial court officers and employees be made cognizant of the fact that diplomatic immunity is not synonymous with Governmental immunity. A demand has been issued to the U.S. Military to do their jobs of defending the U.S. Constitution and to evict these foreign missions (chanceries) from our courts of law. **Superior responsibility rests with you, as the Principals in charge.**

See Something. Do Something

PURSUANT to the American doctrine of; "See Something. Do Something", administrative notice regarding this matter will be sent to the officials annotated herein, including the Chief Administrative Law Judge for the State of Washington, who holds superior responsibility, pertaining to his over-riding endorsement of the June 2018 uniform statewide **Practice Rules of the Appellate Division** that was promulgated by the Presiding Justices of the Appellate Divisions; which became effective September 2018 and are codified outside of CPLR in 22 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 1250.

Most specifically the clause which enables the four Departments the authority to retain the ability to **supplement** and (in "special cases") even **supersede** the uniform rules by promulgating rules of their own, which appears to be the enabling act that is the root cause of the continued legal harassment and legal abuse by US/UN legal service providers.

Private Post Office Address
:Jos: Daniel©
c/o 1776 Park Avenue #142
Summit County, Utah State
Latitude 40° 38' 45" N; Longitude 111° 29' 52" W – Above Sea Level

Like New York trial courts, the State of Washington Commission on Judicial Conduct, as the rule-making arm of the judiciary of Washington, have adopted the Washington Rules of Court as their regulations **and every court has an over-riding endorsement to make local rules for its own government and the government of its officers.**

The judicial discipline process of US federal judges (non-Article III judges) is initiated by the filing of a complaint by any person alleging that a judge has engaged in conduct "prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts, or alleging that such judge is unable to discharge all the duties of the office by reason of mental or physical disability."

We are aware that unlike the judges of Article III courts, non-Article III judges are appointed for specified terms of office. Examples include United States magistrate judges and judges of the United States bankruptcy courts, United States Tax Court, United States Court of Federal Claims, and United States territorial courts.

Though the trial courts of the District of Columbia could be considered "territorial courts" in a semantic sense, since its jurisdiction is not a state; the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, is *not* a U.S. territorial court since D.C. is not an Article III federal judicial district. It operates on limited home rule.

Although the term "non-Article III judges" is used to describe the absence of tenure and salary protection, bankruptcy courts are formally designated as divisions of U.S. District Courts, whose district judges are Article III judicial officers. Moreover, in *Freytag v. Commissioner*, 501 U.S. 868 (1991), the Supreme Court concluded that the judges of the U.S. Tax Court and **their special trial judges** exercise a portion of "the judicial power of the United States (US)."

According to the public record, the chief judge of the circuit has the power to dismiss or conclude the proceeding, or appoint a special committee to investigate the facts and allegations in the complaint. The committee is composed of the chief judge and an equal number of circuit judges and district judges, whom are appointed by the chief judge. The committee must conduct such investigation as it

finds necessary and then expeditiously file a comprehensive written report of its investigation with the judicial council of the circuit involved. Upon receipt of such a report, the judicial council of the circuit involved may conduct any additional investigation it deems necessary, and the committee may dismiss the complaint. **See West Virginia v. EPA.**

If a judge who is the subject of a complaint holds his or her office during good behavior, action taken by the judicial council may include certifying disability of the judge. The judicial council may also, in its discretion, refer any complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 351, along with the record of any associated proceedings and its recommendations for appropriate action, to the Judicial Conference or Judicial Performance Evaluation Commission. The Judicial Performance Evaluation Commission may exercise its authority under the judicial discipline provisions as a conference, or through a standing committee appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States.

Trespasser of the Law

The Court in *Yates v. Village of Hoffman Estates, Illinois*, 209 F. Supp. 757 (N.D. Ill. 1962) held that "not every action by a judge is in the exercise of his judicial function. ... it is not a judicial function for a judge to commit an intentional tort even though the tort occurs in the courthouse. When a judge acts as a trespasser of the law, when a judge does not follow the law, the judge loses subject-matter jurisdiction and the judges' orders are void, of no legal force or effect."

The following *stare decisis* apply; *Hafer v. Melo*, 502 US 21 : "U.S. Supreme Court held that state officials acting by "color of law" may be held personally liable for the injuries or torts they cause and that official or sovereign immunity may not be asserted.", *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 US 232 (1974), 94 S. Ct. 1683, 1687 (1974).

Private Post Office Address
:Jos: Daniel©
c/o 1776 Park Avenue #142
Summit County, Utah State
Latitude 40° 38' 45" N; Longitude 111° 29' 52" W – Above Sea Level

TO REPEAT: Diplomatic immunity is NOT synonymous with Governmental immunity.

When a state officer acts under a state law in a manner violative of the Federal Constitution, he comes into conflict with the superior authority of that Constitution, and he is in that case stripped of his official or representative character and is subjected in his person to the consequences of his individual conduct. The State has no power to impart to him any immunity from responsibility to the supreme authority of the United States (U.S.); Warnock v Pecos County, Texas, 116 F. 3d 776 - No.96-50869 Summary Calendar. July 3, 1997.

Superior Responsibility and Superior Orders

Ultimate responsibility a/k/a superior responsibility a/k/a command responsibility rests with the Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Armed Forces. Command responsibility is also known as the "Medina standard" or superior responsibility. It is the legal doctrine of hierarchical accountability for war crimes.

The doctrine of "command responsibility" was established by the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, partly based on the Lieber code of April 24, 1863, also known as General Order No. 100. The Lieber code is a war manual for the Union forces signed by President Abraham Lincoln in 1863.

The so-called "Medina standard" clarified the U.S. law to clearly also encompass U.S. officers, so that those as well as foreign officers can be prosecuted in the United States (U.S.). It holds that a U.S. commanding officer, being aware of a human rights violation or a war crime, will be held criminally liable if he/she does not take action.

qui facit per alium, facit per se:

"he who acts through another, acts personally."

The United States Supreme Court have already issued a "Ruling" pertaining to the attached referenced legal and or tax matter.

United States Supreme Court Ruling: West Virginia v. EPA – Docket # 20-1530; Decided: June 30, 2022; reiterates the findings of the Tennessee Supreme Court in Norton v Shelby of almost a century ago, which categorically stated; Administrative Law does not apply to the General Public. In fact, the Internal Revenue Code --- (IRC) has also been thrown out in its entirety by the U.S. Supreme Court in the same case, i.e., West Virginia v. EPA.

I, :Jos: Daniel©, am a North American; a Pennsylvanian, and an American without Disability. Any alleged (*ens legis*) privileges and/or benefits are rejected and waived. *Explicitly reserving all rights without prejudice.*

By:  ©
:Jos: Daniel©

Enclosures:

Department of State Touhy Regulation

Response to Tana Lin Defalcation

Recession of Signature – IRS 8822 Form and Mailing Certificate

EXHIBIT STANLEY PACE

NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE CLASS ACTION SUIT

REBELLION AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION

ATTACHMENT B – Special Plea Nul Tiel Corporation